



State of Wisconsin  
Department of Public Instruction  
Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent

---

\*\*\***NEWS RELEASE**\*\*\*

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

DPI 2007-54

Tuesday, June 12, 2007

CONTACT: John Johnson, Communications Director, (608) 266-1098

## Schools receive preliminary progress reports

MADISON—The Department of Public Instruction sent preliminary notification to schools and school districts that missed adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets under federal and state accountability requirements as part of its annual review of school progress.

The review showed that 45 schools and one district have been identified for improvement for missing the same AYP objective for two or more consecutive years.

Wisconsin has worked with the U.S. Department of Education to ensure that the state's AYP formula meets federal requirements for validity and reliability. The formula measures progress on four objectives: graduation rates for high schools and attendance rates for elementary and middle schools; participation in statewide testing; and student achievement on state mathematics and reading assessments. The objectives apply to all students and to subgroups of students by racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, English-language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. The reading and mathematics proficiency targets move up incrementally to 100 percent proficient by 2014. To meet AYP for 2006-07, schools and districts are required to have

- a high school graduation rate of 80 percent and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent, or show growth from the prior year on these indicators.
- 95 percent of their enrolled students participating in statewide reading and mathematics assessments.
- a proficiency index of 67.5 percent in reading and 47.5 percent in mathematics.

State assessments, administered last fall, include the *Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations* (WKCE) and the *Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities*. Unlike previous years, there was no separate *Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for English-Language Learners* due to changing requirements from the U.S. Department of Education. Schools administered the WKCE with accommodations for students who are in the early stages of learning English.

(more)

“As president of the Council of Chief State School Officers and chair of the organization’s committee promoting changes to the federal education law when it is reauthorized in Congress, I am working nationally and with Wisconsin’s congressional delegation to ensure that accountability requirements contained in No Child Left Behind truly help states close the achievement gap and improve education for all students,” said State Superintendent Elizabeth Burmaster.

Of the 45 schools identified for improvement because they missed the same AYP indicator for two or more consecutive years, 19 missed more than one AYP indicator. Most are middle schools or high schools. Three schools came off last year’s list of schools identified for improvement. Thirty-two of the 45 schools are Title I schools that are subject to sanctions contained in the federal No Child Left Behind Act.

Sanctions, which escalate based on the number of years a school is identified for improvement, include allowing parents to send their children to a higher-performing school in the district, providing tutoring services to eligible socio-economically disadvantaged students, writing and implementing a school improvement plan, or restructuring the school. Schools and districts have until June 30 to submit appeals and requests for reconsideration of their progress reports.

“The department has a number of programs that are targeted to build schools’ capacity to improve student achievement,” Burmaster said. “We are working with all Wisconsin teachers, administrators, and school staff members; school board and community members; and students and their parents to close the achievement gap and ensure a quality education for every child.”

In addition to identifying schools for improvement, Wisconsin’s annual review notifies schools and districts that have missed AYP for one or more objectives for a single year. For the 2006-07 review, 95 schools and two districts received preliminary notification that they missed AYP for one year. Forty-two of those schools and one district have already been identified for improvement. Last year, 87 schools missed AYP. Of the schools that missed AYP for 2006-07, 57 missed the reading objective, 44 missed for mathematics, 23 schools missed the graduation and attendance indicator, and 19 missed for test participation. If those schools miss the same objective for a second year, they become a school identified for improvement.

###

**NOTES:** This news release is available electronically at [http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/eis/pdf/dpi2007\\_54.pdf](http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/eis/pdf/dpi2007_54.pdf).

An explanation of adequate yearly progress and provisions of the federal No Child Left Behind Act is attached. Further information on the criteria used to determine adequate yearly progress is available at <http://dpi.wi.gov/oea/acct/ayp.html>.

Schools and school districts have until June 30 to correct data errors that affect their identified for improvement or AYP status. Preliminary lists for the 2006-07 school year of schools and districts identified for improvement and schools and districts missing adequate yearly progress are available at <http://www2.dpi.state.wi.us/sifi/default.asp>.



State of Wisconsin  
Department of Public Instruction  
Elizabeth Burmaster, State Superintendent

## An AYP Primer

Adequate yearly progress (AYP) is one provision in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), federal laws that govern education, first enacted in 1965 and reauthorized in 2001 as the *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) Act. The act encompasses 45 federal programs that distribute more than \$22 billion in education funding to the states. All school districts in Wisconsin receive some federal funding under ESEA.

### NCLB Requirements

Title I, which recognizes the historical link between poverty and low achievement, is the largest of the ESEA programs. School districts receive Title I funding based on the number of children ages 5-17 living in poverty and target funding to their neediest schools. Of the state's more than 2,200 schools, 1,100 share about \$150 million in federal Title I funding to supplement educational opportunities for children who live in high poverty areas: 722 for targeted assistance and 378 as school-wide schools.

Because the state receives and distributes Title I funds, it is subject to Title I requirements. AYP is one of the requirements of the Title I accountability system. State-level Title I requirements are:

- Implement a statewide accountability system that ensures all students will be proficient or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-14.
- Test all students in reading and mathematics in grades 3–8, and once in high school. Test students in science at least once in grades 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.
- Establish AYP objective targets (see table below) that all schools and districts must reach each year.
- Measure and report on the progress of all students and for student groups based on racial/ethnic groups and English proficiency, disability, and income status.
- Identify schools that did not make AYP for all students or any subgroup of students for two or more consecutive years.
- Require all teachers teaching “core academic subjects” to be highly qualified. Core academic subjects under ESEA means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign language, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography.
- Develop a state report card with specific reporting elements prescribed in the law.

### How Does AYP Work?

Under ESEA, all Wisconsin school districts and individual schools within each district must meet the state's four AYP objectives each year. The first two objectives, based on Wisconsin's statewide standardized tests in reading and mathematics, have proficiency targets that move progressively from the starting point to 100 percent proficient by 2014. The U.S. Department of Education (USED) approved

Adequate Yearly Progress  
Proficiency Index  
Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)

		Reading	Mathematics
Starting Point	2001-02	61.0%	37.0%
	2002-03	61.0%	37.0%
	2003-04	61.0%	37.0%
Intermediate Goal (New 3-8 tests begin)	2004-05	67.5%	47.5%
	2005-06	67.5%	47.5%
	2006-07	67.5%	47.5%
Intermediate Goal	2007-08	74.0%	58.0%
	2008-09	74.0%	58.0%
	2009-10	74.0%	58.0%
Intermediate Goal	2010-11	80.5%	68.5%
Intermediate Goal	2011-12	87.0%	79.0%
Intermediate Goal	2012-13	93.5%	89.5%
Goal: All Proficient	2013-14	100%	100%

Wisconsin's progressive targets for reading and mathematics proficiency because the early years will be spent implementing state and local support efforts to improve student achievement.

Since the 2005-06 school year, schools and districts in Wisconsin have been evaluated in reading and mathematics using a Proficiency Index, which awards 1.0 points for all students scoring in the proficient and advanced categories and 0.5 points for all scores in the basic category. In addition to having a reading and mathematics Proficiency Index of 67.5 percent in reading and 47.5 percent in mathematics for 2006-07, the other AYP objectives in the annual review expect schools and districts to have:

- 95 percent of their enrolled students participate in statewide reading and mathematics assessments, which includes the *Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examinations* (WKCE) and the *Wisconsin Alternate Assessment for Students with Disabilities* (WAA-SwD).
- a high school graduation rate of 80 percent, and elementary and middle school attendance rates of at least 85 percent, or show growth from the prior year on these indicators.

The four AYP objectives apply to all students as well as to subgroups of students of a sufficient size. Schools that miss the same AYP objective for one or more student groups for two consecutive years are identified for improvement and may face federal sanctions if they receive Title I funds.

Wisconsin's accountability plan has additional *Safe Harbor* provisions for schools that do not meet the reading or mathematics objectives. Those provisions require that schools reduce by 10 percent the number of students scoring in the basic or minimal performance categories *or* the inverse of their Proficiency Index (100 minus their Proficiency Index) on statewide reading and mathematics tests *and* reach the goal for the other academic indicator (graduation, attendance or science proficiency) as the second provision for *Safe Harbor*.

## Refining and Applying the AYP Formula

Because NCLB includes sanctions among its provisions, the Department of Public Instruction worked with USED to use flexibility guidelines to refine Wisconsin's formula for evaluating schools to maximize consistency around AYP decisions and minimize the potential for errors in determining if a school or district made AYP. The DPI applies statistical procedures to ensure a greater reliability and to avoid over-identifying schools for improvement. Student proficiency is based on the achievement of students enrolled for the full academic year (FAY), and district accountability is divided into grade spans. A district must miss the same AYP target across elementary, middle, and high school for two consecutive years to be found in need of improvement. To increase reliability of AYP decisions, calculations used for accountability purposes differ from those used for general public reporting of the test data such as the Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS).

Although only schools receiving Title I funding are subject to ESEA sanctions, all schools identified for improvement will have access to consultation and technical assistance to improve student achievement. Schools receiving Title I funds are subject to sanctions that range from writing and implementing a school improvement plan to restructuring of the school.

A school identified for improvement at Level 1 (two years of missing AYP on the same indicator) must begin a school improvement process that includes writing a school improvement plan. In addition, the school must offer parents the opportunity to send their child to another higher-performing school in the district. The subsequent years of school and district improvement are described in the grid of *Levels of Accountability* available on the DPI website at <http://dpi.wi.gov/oea/doc/sifilevels.doc>.

## Additional ESEA/NCLB Resources

### Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) — <http://dpi.wi.gov/oea/acct/ayp.html>

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act in Wisconsin: Background and Overview — <http://dpi.wi.gov/esea/background.html>

Office of Educational Accountability — <http://dpi.wi.gov/oea>

Wisconsin Information Network for Successful Schools (WINSS) — <http://dpi.wi.gov/sig/index.html>

U. S. Department of Education <http://www.ed.gov>